

Response

The claims have been amended as indicated above. The amendments are fully supported by the specification, claims, and figures as originally filed. No new matter is believed or intended to be involved.

The following is responsive the Examiner's request in the Office communication for an explanation how the present claims overcome Kamejima (4,549,208) in view of the 102(b) rejection recited in the Office Action dated 09/05/2002. The distinctions between the present claims and Kamejima are many. Initially, it should be noted that Kamejima does not teach digitizing image signals, nor processing of digitized signals. Instead, Kamejima uses a "television camera 5B", which appears to be a purely analog system, especially when read in view of the state of the art in 1983 when Kamejima was filed. Kamejima is silent on the type of lens that is on the television camera 5B, so it is apparently has an ordinary lens. Light is reflected from a convex mirror 5A to the television camera 5B. Moreover, Kamejima teaches:

In order to more enlarge the range of the field of view, however, the television camera 5B may be constructed to be rockable relative to the convex mirror 5A as shown in FIG. 6. Further, as shown in FIG. 7, the television camera 5B may be constructed to be movable rectilinearly relative to the convex mirror 5A and translated by an actuator. It is also possible to tilt or more [sic] the convex mirror 5A relative to the television camera 5B. Further, only the lens portion of the television camera 5B may be moved as shown in FIG. 8. It is also possible to combine these measures. Since drive means therefor can be readily realized, the details shall be omitted from the description. Moreover, only an area to be noted can be received in the whole field of view of the camera 5B by changing the focal length of the lens of the television camera 5B. The movement of the camera 5B and the adjustment of the focal length in series are executed in accordance with external instructions. The external instructions can be given as the operator's instructions by way of example.

Kamejima at col. 3, line 68 - col. 4, line 19 (emphasis added). In other words, Kamejima teaches that in order to achieve a wide field of view, either the camera or the mirror must physically move to view an area of interest. Thus, this embodiment works in essentially the same way as a mechanical pan/tilt/zoom camera; namely, the camera is moved to view an area of interest.

While not cited in the Office Action, Applicants note that Figs. 9 and 10 of Kamejima discloses an embodiment with a fisheye lens; however, Kamejima acknowledges that this embodiment will not work with the fisheye lens capturing a wide field of view:

In the case of this embodiment, since the fisheye lens 5C is used, the picture obtained with the corresponding television camera 5B is more compressed in the area closer to the peripheral edge of the field of view. Thus the resolution of the peripheral part of the picture is degraded. In order to compensate for this drawback, an area of which a high resolution is required may be scanned continually at the center of the screen. However, continually monitoring the subject area at the center of the screen makes it necessary to frequently move the television camera 5B. An expedient for solving this problem will be described with reference to FIG. 10.

Kamejima at col. 4, lines 34-46 (emphasis added). Again, Kamejima teaches that in order to achieve a wide field of view, the camera must physically move to view an area of interest. Thus, this embodiment also works in essentially the same way as a mechanical pan/tilt/zoom camera; namely, the camera is moved to view an area of interest.

Applicants submit that the foregoing teachings of Kamejima are substantially different than the invention as currently claimed. Beyond the many differences discussed above, all the pending claims require (in abbreviated form) the selection of a portion of the wide-angle digitized image. Further, transform parameters are calculated based on the selected portion. Kamejima simply does not teach or suggest any of these limitations as currently claimed.

While Applicants have noted some of the significant differences between the pending claims and over Kamejima, it should be noted that other claimed features are not taught or suggested in Kamejima. Furthermore, the dependent claims add other limitations that further distinguish over Kamejima. Applicants reserve all rights and arguments with respect to those claimed features not expressly discussed above.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims overcome the rejections presented in the Office Action, and respectfully request reconsideration and an early notice of allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



Victor C. Moreno (40,732)
Frost Brown Todd LLC
2200 PNC Center
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-4182
Tel: 513-651-6812
Fax: 513-651-6981

Certificate of Mailing

The undersigned certifies that this correspondence was deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on June 18, 2004.

